

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 5, 2003.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15. Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

Claims 1-15 are thus pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and following remarks.

Specification

The abstract has been objected to. The abstract has been replaced.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 was objected to, on the basis that "and retrieving said second error message from said error translation table corresponding to said first error message" is repeated.

Applicants traverse the objection, because the phrase is not repeated. A similar phrase occurs in claim 12, but claim 12 does not refer to an error translation table.

Claim Rejections – 32 USC § 101

Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected for not being embedded in a computer embedded medium. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the method is a computer embedded medium method, involving a computer embedded medium such as hardware and/or software. Claims 2 and 9 depend from claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 32 USC § 102

Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mikovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,529).

Claim 1 as amended claims in part: "intercepting the first error message".

Claim 10 claims in part: "intercepting a first error message corresponding to said error".

Claim 12 as amended claims in part: "intercepting the first error message".

In contrast, Miksovsky does not teach error interception. Instead, every error in the Miksovsky system results in the error handling mechanism using a centralized error handling mechanism in the form of an internal API. (see column 5, lines 60-63). Because of this, the Miksovsky system teaches an environment where the dynamic error handling has been designed into the system from the very beginning, and interception is unnecessary.

Because Miksovsky fails to teach claims 1, 10, and 12, and dependent claims 2-5, 10, 13, and 14, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miksovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,529) in view of Viet (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,147).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miksovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,529) in view of Viet (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,147) and Boivie (U.S. Patent No. 4,453,217).

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miksovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,529) in view of Ganugapati (U.S. 2002/0114438).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miksovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,529) in view of Noguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,150) and Schoettger (U.S. 2002/0069366).

None of the cited art teaches or suggests “intercepting the first error message” as claimed in claim 1, and “intercepting the first error message” as claimed in claim 12.

Applicants request withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) against claims 6-9 and 15 which depend from claims 1 and 12.

Appln. No. 09/815,441
Amendment Dated: January 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 5, 2003


CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 28903.707).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2004

By 
Kenta Suzue, Reg. No. 45,145

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Customer No. 021971